Dear Paul, 7/15/75

Jim gave me your note of the 9th today after the hearing. It helps me much because of the understanding of the way your mind works that is unhidden - except, I presume to you - in it.

It reflect an arrogance of mind that, while I think you will note face it, I hope you will. It also reflects a political immaturity that would not be favorable to a high school sophomore.

First let me assure you that from the time I first heard a few words from Judge Pratt I knew we would lose, regardless of how overwhelming our case. So there is no suggestion that you in any way contributed to this loss. In fact I've been trying to warn those who pretend an interest in the law that this would be inevitable and would hurt.

You are impervious to anyone else's ideas. It anyone else is involved in something and would by the average mortal be assumed to have some knowledge because of personal involvement, this is irrelevant to you because you have this truly superior intellect, understand and appreciation before which naught else is or can be of any consequence or meaning.

Now that it is too late for the record we sought to make at this level, I think that in time I'll be able to get an average college freshman who will be able to do the thing I asked of you and that noble spirit Lifton of those gaping promises.

Intending no offense, I'll try to make simpler what with Jim's agreement I sought and ask of both of you.

Colleges do teach spectroscopy and neitron activation analysis.

Commonly teaching is done with books, known as text books.

The purpose of these texts is to set forth what the students are to study and learn. Even more than 40 years ago when I was a student, in the comparatively blighted time, this was true.

Perhaps I expect too much of the texts of your generation, but I did and do expect that where they deal with these two tests they will tell those who are to learn from the texts how to do them. This, by the standard with which I am familiar, could be expected to include standards and means. But if the texts communicate anything at all they would, despite my experience with what education has done to you, tell students how to perform these two tests. Because they are tests that involve comparisons, perhaps foolishly I do presume they tell students how to do them.

This is what I wanted, xeroxed, so we could out it in the court record.

Where I live people are on the federal teat. So, although the local college can not be compared with those available to you and Lifton might be expected to hold this kind of information, the faculty members were uneasy. Ditto for Maryland, where I also had inquiries made. Before I after speaking to Jim wrote you and Dave.

I know people who work for the AEC. I've not asked them for the same reason. Jobs.

Unless there is gross error in my reasoning, I do believe that with the library facilities you and Dave have available and the training you have both had, getting what I asked was a simple matter. Unless xeroxing standard texts is not simple.

Where you got that jazz about "evaluation" and whatever you may mean by "abstract" I don't know. In that of my language formulated more than once you did note "standards and methods." This is <u>all</u> I wanted: you the hell you do them, if you do them properly. No learned dissertations, no arcane philosophy. Just the simple how to do. Xeroxed from standard texts.

I raised no question of "standards for use in court." The intded use made your complications and additions irrelevant. And what Jim would know about he would not let me bounce to you.

I think this illustrates the problem: that nobody knows a damned thing except you, that you can't pay attention to what people say but have to add complications for which there is no basis, so what is not involved you make involved. What I say I want and need and say that Jim says we want and need makes no difference. You have your own ideas and nothing makes any difference. How can you not know best?

"The actual data" which you say is necessary if you are to help isn't worth

worth a damn in the sense you use it. There is, of course, the notion you may find silly, that I can tell you what help I need in a case in which I have invested so much time much better than you, for your your towering intelligence, can divine it. If for one minute Jim or I - either- thought you could be of help with "the actual data" do you dobt for a minute that you'd have had it before we could tell you what we'd like of it?

Maybe you expected the FBI to roll over dead just because I filed a suit?

Did I not often enough tell you that we did not have "the actual data" and, when I had all I'd get, subject to the specified condition, would give it to you?

"The actual data" was as relevant in this suit as your last night's supper.

The legal situation was quite another thing. It is the legal situation we had to face, not a solution to the crime.

I haven't had an expert look at a single worksheet they gave me. I know they are not quitting and they'd give me nothing of this value. Confirmed by an authentic expert, Guinn.

It does not shake the world to have the opinion, "I think the least effecient way to reach an understanding of what the FBI did would be to draw up general standards for such test and only then to look at the actual data."

You stubborn arrogant thing. Who the h ell told you the "actual data" was relevant? Did I? Did Jim?

Where do you get the notion it was even an issued before the court?

"Efficiency" was not an issue.

"What the FBI did" was not the issue. Nor "understanding." Nor our "drawing up general standards."

There remains "I" and "think." The "I" is one of the reason I take this time instead of going to sleep when I got up at 4. Give some thought to this "I" and how it has carried you to heights of self-concept and self-importance.

"Think" you did not do because if you'd thought and you didn't understand you'd not have waited all these months to so much as ask a question and you'd not have assumed we know nothing at all about what we are doing. Or needed.

To address the rest of your irrelevancies, there was no issue before the court covered by "the FBI's work may well have been deficient in many minor[sic] ways..."

The issue is the creation of your arrogance and inability to pay attention to others and a concept that nobody else knows anything.

The only thin left is "although they may might caused the FBI's work to be technically unsatisfactory." Please believe me, in this case this was not an issue.

You have not yet come into contact with any single issue in this case, as it was in court. The court was not trying the assassination.

If you want to argue the point although I'd rather forget this unpleasantness I'll take the time. The questions revolve around what was before the court not what you wanted them to be.

I'M not letting off a head of steam in taking this time. There are always other ways I can do that. I'm trying to break through the castOiron around your mind, which is a very fine mind that ought not be imprisoned. There is no other reason I'd think of taking any more time on this.

The past tells me I waste the time. But I do try. And I suggest to you that you begin by asking yourself if you were in any way trying to think as I asked you to think, if you had any way of knowing better than I what we needed in this case or any at all of knowing what the legal issues and needs were.

I know you think I'm trying to hog everything. If I never get another paper I could write for ten more years. I did let everyone know that when I got everything I was going to get I'd make copies available. Aside from this and for entirely different reasons, I did have every paper I then had at a press conference with 40 reporters 4/25 and offer all to them, I did make separate offers to the Post, the three nets, USNews & World Report and others. I did xerox and give the 1/22 transcript to all who would take it and then spent weeks getting it used. Some samples only. This is hogging? My concern is misuse. If you haven't seen to much of this you are blind...Heal theyself, physician. Lifton The Silent is beyond healing. I hope you and your self concept are not. Quite sincerely,